**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**

**APPELLATE SIDE**

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 394 OF 2002**
**IN**
**CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 53 OF 2002**
WITH

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 395 OF 2002**
**IN**
**CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 54 OF 2002**
WITH

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 396 OF 2002**
**IN**
**CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 55 OF 2002**
WITH

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 397 OF 2002**
**IN**
**CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 56 OF 2002**

The Assistant Registrar of
Companies, Maharashtra. ... Applicant.

V/s.

M/s.Mazda Fabric Processors
Limited and others. ... Respondents.

H.V.Mehta for the applicant.

Rakesh Datar for respondent No.5.

Rajesh More, APP for respondent No.6- State.

**CORAM: V.C.DAGA, J.**

**DATED: 5th October 2007.**

**P.C.:**
**----**

. Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

2. In view of dismissal of the substantive revision applications against the main accused, i.e. the company and two of its directors, the impugned order against them has become final. There cannot be two different orders running against each other in one proceeding [see 1998 (1) Mh.L.J. 928, *Sheela v. Cental Bank*]. In that view of the matter, no useful purpose would be survived by condoning the delay. Even if the delay is condoned, revision applications would not survive.

3. In the above view of the matter, all the applications are rejected.

**JUDGE**